

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 10, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 12-22. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes Applicants have amended claims 1-9 and 12-22, with claims 10, 11, and 23-26 being withdrawn. No new matter has been added. Applicants believe that the new set of claims is patentable. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

I. Restriction Requirement

The Office Action withdrew claims 10, 11, and 22-26. Applicants maintain their traverse of the basis for the Election/Restriction requirement for the previous reasons provided. Applicants reserve the right to pursue divisional applications and request rejoinder of claims 10, 11, and 22-26 if possible.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the suggestion of allowable subject matter of claims 1-2, 4-9, 12-22 if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 USC § 112.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The Office Action rejected to claims 1-2, 4-9, and 12-22 suggesting that the claims are indefinite. Without acquiescing in this suggestion, Applicants have amended the language of the claims where necessary to overcome the rejection.

a. Support for Amended Claims 12, 13, and 18

Applicants have amended claims 12, 13, and 18 to additionally describe the structure of the present invention. No new matter has been added. Support for the amended claims 12 and 13 under 35 USC § 112 can be found in claim 1 as originally filed. Support for the amended claim 18 under 35 USC § 112 can be found in claims 1 and 9 as originally filed.

IV. Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claim 3 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Meister et al. Without acquiescing in this suggestion, Applicants have amended the language of the claim 3 so that claim 3 is now dependent on allowable claim 1. Accordingly, the present proposed claim is allowable.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.


CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Dated: 12/08, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Zdurne
Registration No. 58,680
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215